20. "The Carter Doctrine on the Middle East,"[287] January 1980, as explained (below) by Defense Secretary Harold Brown, Assistant Secretary of State William Dyess, and other spokesmen.
21. Serious White House and JCS consideration, in August 1980,[288] of the possible imminent use of tactical nuclear weapons if a secret Soviet buildup on the Iranian border led to a Soviet invasion of Iran, followed by the expression of explicit, secret nuclear warnings to the Soviet Union (a hidden episode, spelled out in a professional military journal and by articles in the *New York Times*, that remains virtually unknown to the U.S. public and even scholars, though presidential press secretary Jody Powell was quoted as describing it as "the most serious nuclear crisis since the Cuban missile crisis").†
22. The Carter Doctrine reaffirmed in essence,[289] including its nuclear component, by President Reagan in January 1981.
23. Formal threats by the George H. W. Bush administration[290] of possible U.S. nuclear response to various possible "unconscionable actions" by Iraq in Operation Desert Storm in January 1991.
24. Explicit, secret threats by the Clinton administration[291] of nuclear use against North Korea in 1995 on its nuclear reactor program (following the near-launch of an American conventional attack in 1994).†
25. Public warning of a nuclear option by Clinton's secretary of defense[292] William Perry against Libya's Tarhuna underground chemical weapons facility in 1996.†

It follows from this listing (and more recent threats discussed below) that there has been no seventy-year moratorium on the active consideration and use of nuclear threats to support "atomic diplomacy."[293] Whatever the inhibitions about pulling the trigger—and the record suggests that these have been strong, even in stalemated wars like Korea and Vietnam—there is no basis whatever for speaking of a "taboo" against nuclear weapons' use,[294] whether in threats or actual attacks. Contrary to what has often been said about nuclear weapons, there is no "tradition of non-*use*."[295] It is fair to